Appl. No. 10/051,353
Amdt. dated October 8, 2008
Reply to Office Action of July 9, 2008

Remarks

The present amendment responds to the Official Action dated July 9, 2008. The Official Action rejected claims 2-4 under 35 U.S.C. 112. The Official Action rejected claims 1-6, 9, and 24, 25, 29, 30, and 32-36 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) based on Freeny U.S. Patent No. 6,490,443 (Freeny) in view of Drummond U.S. Patent No. 7,080,036 (Drummond). The Official Action rejected claims 26-28 and 31 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) based on Freeny in view of Drummond and further in view of Zalewski U.S. Patent No. 7,155,199 (Zalewski).

These grounds of rejection are addressed below. Claims 1, 2, 6, and 9 have been amended to be more clear and distinct. Claims 7, 8, and 10-23 were previously canceled. Claims 1-6, 9, and 24-36 are presently pending.

The 112 Rejections

The Official Action rejected claims 2-4 under 35 U.S.C. 112 as indefinite. With the present amendment to claim 2, this ground of rejection has been overcome and should be withdrawn.

The Art Rejections

The art rejections hinge on the application of Freeny in combination with Drummond or with Drummond and Zalewski. As addressed in greater detail below, Freeny, Drummond, and Zalewski do not support the Official Action's reading of them and the rejections based thereupon should be reconsidered and withdrawn. Further, the Applicants do not acquiesce in the analysis of Freeny, Drummond, and Zalewski made by the Official Action and respectfully traverse the Official Action's analysis underlying its rejections.

6

Appl. No. 10/051,353
Amdt. dated October 8, 2008
Reply to Office Action of July 9, 2008

The Official Action rejected claims 1-6, 9, 24, 25, 29, 30, and 32-36 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) based on Freeny in view of Drummond. In light of the present amendments to claims 1, 6, and 9, this ground of rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1, as amended, addresses a method of operating a self service terminal (SST). The method comprises the steps of receiving wireless communication signals from a mobile computing device in the vicinity of an SST and engaging in communication with the device to detect one or more characteristics relating to device capabilities of the mobile computing device and user preferences of a user of the mobile computing device, and configuring an SST user interface of the SST to accommodate detected device capabilities and user preferences. Configuration of the user interface of the SST includes adapting information presented on a display screen of the SST based on user preferences detected through communication with the mobile computing device.

The limitations of claim 1 in the claimed combination are not taught and are not made obvious by Freeny, Drummond, or a combination thereof. Freeny teaches systems and techniques for providing services to users of mobile devices, including detecting the proximity of a mobile device to a device delivering services to users. Depending on the service being provided, Freeny may deliver services from a delivery point to a mobile device without a need for the user to approach the delivery device, or may deliver services to the user through interaction with the user at the delivery point. Freeny may detect that the mobile device is in proximity to the delivery device such that services can be provided through the mobile device without a need to approach the delivery device, or on a closer approach to the delivery device,

7

Freeny may detect that services are to be provided through the delivery device through interaction with a user.

However, Freeny does not address adapting a display to present options based on user preferences detected through communication with a wireless computing device, as claimed by claim 1. Such adaptation allows for customization of menu options presented to a user using device capability and user preference information easily accessible through the user's mobile device, even in cases in which the user is not employing the wireless device to conduct the transaction, allowing both presentation of a display adapted to the user's preferences and the use of capabilities of a device that are related to a transaction carried out through user interaction with a terminal, such presenting the user with an option to store supplemental information relating to a transaction.

The Official Action relies on Drummond as teaching presentation of selected advertising and other information to customers, but Drummond teaches a method of programming an automated banking machine and presenting displays appropriate to a particular customer based on information in a stored customer profile. Drummond does not address detecting characteristics relating to device capabilities of a mobile computing device. Drummond does not address any adaptation or configuration of interfaces or other operational characteristics of a self service terminal based on any detected device capabilities of a mobile computing device. Drummond adapts to a customer based on the customer's profile, but does not contemplate the use of a mobile computing device by a customer or any need to adapt to such a computing device.

8

Drummond mentions a smart card as one possible source of profile information, but Drummond contemplates that the smart card serves simply as a data store, and the automated banking machine of Drummond does not communicate with the card to identify its capabilities and does not adapt its operation based on capabilities of the card. Claim 1, as amended, therefore defines over the cited art and should be allowed.

Claim 6, as amended, addresses a method of operating a self service terminal (SST). The method comprises the steps of receiving wireless communication signals from a mobile computing device in the vicinity of an SST and engaging in communication with the device to identify selected capabilities of the device, and selecting features of a user interface to be presented to a user dependent on the detected capabilities of the mobile computing device. The features of the user interface are adapted so as to accommodate the detected capabilities of the mobile computing device. Adapting features of the user interface includes presenting options on a display of the SST including options made available based on the detected capabilities of the mobile computing device. As noted above with respect to claim 1, Freeny does not teach that adapting features of a display of an SST includes presenting options on a display of the SST, including presenting options made available based on the detected capabilities of the mobile computing device, and adding Drummond to Freeny does not achieve these features. Claim 6, as amended, therefore defines over the cited art and should be allowed.

Claim 9, as amended, addresses a self service terminal (SST) comprising a configurable user interface. The SST further comprises means for receiving wireless communication signals from a mobile computing device in the vicinity of the SST and engaging in communication with the device to identify one or more of device capabilities and stored user preferences

9

Appl. No. 10/051,353
Amdt. dated October 8, 2008
Reply to Office Action of July 9, 2008

characterizing the mobile computing device. The SST further comprises means for determining

the configuration of the user interface to be presented so as to accommodate the device

capabilities and user preferences. Configuration of the user interface of the SST includes

adapting information presented on a display screen of the SST based on device capabilities and

user preferences detected through communication with the mobile computing device. As noted

above with respect to claim 1, neither Freeny, Drummond, nor a combination thereof teaches or

make obvious that configuration of a user interface of includes adapting information presented on

a display screen of the SST based on device capabilities and user preferences detected through

communication with a mobile computing device. Claim 9, as amended, therefore defines over

the cited art and should be allowed.

The Official Action rejected claims 26-28 and 31 based on Freeny in view of Drummond

and further in view of Zalewski. Claims 26-28 and 31 are dependent claims having claim 1 as a

base claim. Because claim 1 has been shown to be allowable, claims 26-28 and 31 should also

be allowed.

Conclusion

All of the presently pending claims, as amended, appearing to define over the applied

references, withdrawal of the present rejection and prompt allowance are requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Peter H. Priest
Reg. No. 30,210
Priest & Goldstein, PLLC
5015 Southpark Drive, Suite 230
Durham, NC 27713-7736
(919) 806-1600

10